UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,037	09/15/2003	Ajith N. Nair	A-8772	2530

5642   7590   12/10/2007
SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
5030 SUGARLOAF PARKWAY
LAWRENCEVILLE, GA 30044

EXAMINER
MENDOZA, JUNIOR O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4115	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/10/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOmail@sciatl.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 September 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/14/2003 01/28/05</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The applicant

states in paragraph [0042], "Compressing or decompressing a video segment having

the second format requires more STT 200 resources ***that*** compressing...", where the

sentence should be changed to "Compressing or decompressing a video segment

having the second format requires more STT 200 resources ***than*** compressing...".

        Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2.   Claim 31 is objected to because of the following informalities: the applicant

states, "wherein the encoder configured to recompress the compressed video stream

comprises is configured to decode the compressed video stream", the word

"comprises" should be omitted; where the examiner interprets that the applicant meant

to claim the following: "wherein the encoder configured to recompress the compressed

video stream is configured to decode the compressed video stream".

        Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   **Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 10-24, 26, 28-38 and 40** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

as being anticipated by Rao et al (Pub No US 2003/0233663). Hereinafter referenced

as Rao.

Regarding **claim 1**, Rao discloses a method comprising the steps of:

encoding a video stream in a first compressed format (Input signal [112] is

encoded in encoder [114], paragraph [0015] also exhibited on fig 4);

storing the video stream encoded in the first compressed format in a storage

device (Encoded signal is stored in Hard drive [116], paragraph [0015] also exhibited on

fig 4);

retrieving the video stream encoded in the first compressed format from the

storage device (Recording station [410] receives the signal [124a], paragraph [0029]

also exhibited on fig 4);

decoding the video stream encoded in the first compressed format (Decoder

[412] decodes the received signal, paragraph [0029] also exhibited on fig 4);

encoding the decoded video stream in a second compressed format (Encoder

[416] encodes the received signal into another format, in this case a handheld device

video and audio format, paragraph [0029] also exhibited on fig 4);

and storing the video stream encoded in the second compressed format in the

storage device (After being encoded at encoder [416] the signal is stored at storage

[420], paragraph [0029] also exhibited on fig 4).

Regarding **claim 2**, Rao discloses everything claimed as applied above (See

claim 1); in addition, Rao discloses the method of claim 1, wherein

the method is implemented by a television set-top terminal (The PVR [110] can

be integrated into a set top box which would be part of a system used to receive

audio/video content, paragraph [0016] also exhibited on fig 2).

Regarding **claim 3**, Rao discloses everything claimed as applied above (See

claim 1); in addition, Rao discloses the method of claim 1, wherein

the second compressed format enables a higher compression rate than the first

compressed format (Media content is transcoded from a television signal to a portable

device, trading off media content file size and quality in order to achieve a particular file

size, paragraph [0014]).

Regarding **claim 5**, Rao discloses a method comprising the steps of:

encoding a video stream such that the video stream has a first bit-rate (Encoded

signal is stored in Hard drive [116], paragraph [0015] also exhibited on fig 4; where the

objective of the referenced invention is to reduce the bit rate of the video so that more

data can be saved in a portable device, paragraph [0005]);

storing the video stream having the first bit-rate in a storage device (Encoded

signal is stored in Hard drive [116], paragraph [0015] also exhibited on fig 4);

retrieving the video stream having the first bit-rate from the storage device

(Recording station [410] receives the signal [124a], paragraph [0029] also exhibited on

fig 4);

decoding the video stream having the first bit-rate (Decoder [412] decodes the

received signal, paragraph [0029] also exhibited on fig 4);

encoding the decoded video stream such that the decoded video stream has a

second bit-rate that is lower than the first bit-rate (Encoder [416] encodes the received

signal into another format, in this case a handheld device video and audio format,

paragraph [0029] also exhibited on fig 4);

and storing the video stream having the second bit-rate in the storage device

(After being encoded at encoder [416] the signal is stored at storage [420], paragraph

[0029] also exhibited on fig 4).

Regarding **claim 6**, Rao discloses everything claimed as applied above (See

claim 5); in addition, Rao discloses the method of claim 5, wherein the method is

implemented by a television set-top terminal (The PVR [110] can be integrated into a

set top box which would be part of a system used to receive audio/video content,

paragraph [0016] also exhibited on fig 2).

Regarding **claim 10**, Rao discloses a method comprising the steps of:

receiving a video stream (The PVR [110] can be integrated into a set top box which would be part of a system used to receive audio/video content, paragraph [0016] also exhibited on fig 2);

compressing the video stream in a manner that is responsive to the availability of computing resources (the media content is transmitted to the recording station [210] as a compressed stream, paragraph [0029]);

and recompressing the compressed video stream in a manner that is responsive to the availability of computing resources (Recording station [210] transcodes a program and saves the compressed file in hard drive [216], paragraph [0026] also exhibited on fig 2; moreover, in another embodiment of the reference a PC can decode the received signal from the PVR and recompress it into a handheld video and audio format, paragraph [0035]).

Regarding **claim 11**, Rao discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 10); in addition, Rao discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the step of recompressing the compressed video stream comprises:

decoding the compressed video stream format (Decoder [412] decodes the received signal, paragraph [0029] also exhibited on fig 4);

and encoding the decoded video stream (Encoder [416] encodes the received signal into another format, in this case a handheld device video and audio format, paragraph [0029] also exhibited on fig 4).

Regarding **claim 12**, Rao discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 10); in addition, Rao discloses the method of claim 10, wherein

the computing resources comprise at least one of an instruction execution resource, bus bandwidth, memory capacity, storage capacity, and access to storage capacity (The compressed video is store in hard drive [158], where the operations are controlled by the command and control device [120a] as exhibited on fig 1).

Regarding **claim 13**, Rao discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 10); in addition, Rao discloses the method of claim 10, wherein

the method is implemented by a television set-top terminal (STT) (The PVR [110] can be integrated into a set top box which would be part of a system used to receive audio/video content, paragraph [0016] also exhibited on fig 2).

Regarding **claim 14,** Rao discloses a method comprising the steps of:

receiving a video stream (The PVR [110] can be integrated into a set top box which would be part of a system used to receive audio/video content, paragraph [0016] also exhibited on fig 2);

compressing the video stream in a manner that is responsive to one or more characteristics of the received video stream (The media content is transmitted to the recording station [210] as a compressed stream, paragraph [0029]);

and recompressing the compressed video stream in a manner that is responsive to one or more characteristics of the compressed video stream (Recording station [210]

transcodes a program and saves the compressed file in hard drive [216], paragraph

[0026] also exhibited on fig 2; moreover, in another embodiment of the reference a PC

can decode the received signal from the PVR and recompress it into a handheld video

and audio format, paragraph [0035]).

Regarding **claim 15**, Rao discloses everything claimed as applied above (See

claim 14); in addition, Rao discloses the method of claim 14, wherein

the received video stream is compressed in a manner that is responsive to at

least one of a format of the received video stream, a bit rate of the received video

stream, a picture size corresponding to the received video stream, a frame rate of the

received video stream, a color characteristics of the received video stream, a complexity

of the received video stream, or frame types that are included in the received video

stream (The recording station uses metadata to control the transcoding of media

content, where the format metadata includes bit rates, frame rates, file sizes, etc,

paragraph [0013]).

Regarding **claim 16**, Rao discloses everything claimed as applied above (See

claim 14); in addition, Rao discloses the method of claim 14, wherein

the compressed video stream is recompressed in a manner that is responsive to

at least one of a format of the compressed video stream, a bit rate of the compressed

video stream, a picture size corresponding to the compressed video stream, a frame

rate of the compressed video stream, a color characteristics of the compressed video

stream, a complexity of the compressed video stream, or frame types that are included

in the compressed video stream (The recording station uses metadata to control the

transcoding of media content in order to recompress the incoming signal, where the

format metadata includes bit rates, frame rates, file sizes, etc, paragraph [0013]).

    Regarding **claim 17**, Rao discloses everything claimed as applied above (See

claim 14); in addition, Rao discloses the method of claim 14, wherein the step of

recompressing the compressed video stream comprises:

    decoding the compressed video stream (Decoder [412] decodes the received

signal, paragraph [0029] also exhibited on fig 4);

    and encoding the decoded video stream (Encoder [416] encodes the received

signal into another format, in this case a handheld device video and audio format,

paragraph [0029] also exhibited on fig 4).

    Regarding **claim 18**, Rao discloses everything claimed as applied above (See

claim 14); in addition, Rao discloses the method of claim 14, wherein

    the method is implemented by a television set-top terminal (STT) (The PVR [110]

can be integrated into a set top box which would be part of a system used to receive

audio/video content, paragraph [0016] also exhibited on fig 2).

Regarding **claim 19**, Rao discloses a method comprising the steps of:

monitoring consumption of computing resources over an extended time period

(Control metadata is used to control and monitor the flow of information to the storage

device [420], paragraph [0029]; moreover, user metadata embodies the concept of user

preference with respect to media content and it includes the viewing habits of the user,

paragraph [0013]);

receiving a video stream (The PVR [110] can be integrated into a set top box

which would be part of a system used to receive audio/video content, paragraph [0016]

also exhibited on fig 2);

compressing the video stream (the media content is transmitted to the recording

station [210] as a compressed stream, paragraph [0029]);

and recompressing the compressed video stream at a future time that is

responsive to availability of computing resources at the future time (Recording station

[210] transcodes a program and saves the compressed file in hard drive [216],

paragraph [0026] also exhibited on fig 2; moreover, in another embodiment of the

reference a PC can decode the received signal from the PVR and recompress it for into

a handheld video and audio format, paragraph [0035]).

Regarding **claim 20**, Rao discloses everything claimed as above (see claim 19);

in addition, claim 20 incorporates all the limitations of claim 12. Therefore, claim 20

stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 12) since it is inherent

to the method claimed in claim 12.

Regarding **claim 21**, Rao discloses everything claimed as applied above (See

claim 19); in addition, Rao discloses the method of claim 19, wherein

the step of monitoring consumption of computing resources comprises

monitoring user input (Control metadata is used to control and monitor the flow of

information to the storage device [420], paragraph [0029]; moreover, user metadata

embodies the concept of user preference with respect to media content and it includes

the viewing habits of the user, paragraph [0013]).

Regarding **claim 22**, Rao discloses everything claimed as above (see claim 19);

in addition, claim 22 incorporates all the limitations of claim 13. Therefore, claim 22

stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 13) since it is inherent

to the method claimed in claim 13.

Regarding **claim 23**, Rao discloses everything as claimed; in addition, claim 23

incorporates all the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, claim 23 stands rejected for the

same reasons as stated above (see claim 1) since it is inherent to the method claimed

in claim 1.

Regarding **claim 24**, Rao discloses everything claimed as above (see claim 23);

in addition, claim 24 incorporates all the limitations of claim 3. Therefore, claim 24

stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 3) since it is inherent

to the method claimed in claim 3.

Regarding **claim 26**, Rao discloses everything as claimed; in addition, claim 26 incorporates all the limitations of claim 5. Therefore, claim 26 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 5) since it is inherent to the method claimed in claim 5.

Regarding **claim 28**, Rao discloses everything claimed as above (see claim 26); in addition, claim 28 incorporates all the limitations of claim 8. Therefore, claim 28 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 8) since it is inherent to the method claimed in claim 8.

Regarding **claim 29**, Rao discloses everything claimed as above (see claim 26); in addition, claim 29 incorporates all the limitations of claim 9. Therefore, claim 29 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 9) since it is inherent to the method claimed in claim 9.

Regarding **claim 30**, Rao discloses everything as claimed; in addition, claim 30 incorporates all the limitations of claims 1 and 10. Therefore, claim 30 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claims 1 and 10) since it is inherent to the method claimed in claims 1 and 10, respectively.

Regarding **claim 31**, Rao discloses everything claimed as above (see claim 30); in addition, claim 31 incorporates all the limitations of claims 10 and 11. Therefore, claim 31 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claims 10 and 11) since it is inherent to the method claimed in claims 10 and 11, respectively.

Regarding **claim 32**, Rao discloses everything claimed as above (see claim 30); in addition, claim 32 incorporates all the limitations of claim 12. Therefore, claim 32 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 12) since it is inherent to the method claimed in claim 12.

Regarding **claim 33**, Rao discloses everything as claimed; in addition, claim 33 incorporates all the limitations of claims 1 and 14. Therefore, claim 33 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claims 1 and 14) since it is inherent to the method claimed in claims 1 and 14, respectively.

Regarding **claim 34**, Rao discloses everything claimed as above (see claim 33); in addition, claim 34 incorporates all the limitations of claim 15. Therefore, claim 34 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 15) since it is inherent to the method claimed in claim 15.

Regarding **claim 35**, Rao discloses everything claimed as above (see claim 33); in addition, claim 35 incorporates all the limitations of claim 16. Therefore, claim 35 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 16) since it is inherent to the method claimed in claim 16.

Regarding **claim 36**, Rao discloses everything claimed as above (see claim 33); in addition, claim 36 incorporates all the limitations of claim 31. Therefore, claim 36 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 31) since it is inherent to the method claimed in claim 31.

Regarding **claim 37**, Rao discloses everything as claimed; in addition, claim 37 incorporates all the limitations of claims 1 and 10. Therefore, claim 37 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claims 1 and 10) since it is inherent to the method claimed in claims 1 and 10, respectively.

Regarding **claim 38**, Rao discloses everything claimed as above (see claim 37); in addition, claim 38 incorporates all the limitations of claim 12. Therefore, claim 38 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 12) since it is inherent to the method claimed in claim 12.

Regarding **claim 40**, Rao discloses everything as claimed; in addition, claim 40

incorporates all the limitations of claims 1, 3, 23 and 25. Therefore, claim 40 stands

rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claims 1, 3, 23 and 25) since it is

inherent to the method claimed in claims 1, 3, 23 and 25, respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   **Claims 4, 25 and 27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Rao in view of Mori et al. (Patent No 6,931,064). Hereinafter referenced as Mori.

Regarding **claim 4**, Rao discloses everything claimed as applied above (See

claim 1); however, it is noted that Rao fails to explicitly disclose that the first

compressed format is a format of lesser computational complexity than the second

compressed format. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art

to provide such element, as taught by Mori.

In a similar field of endeavor Mori discloses the method of claim 1, wherein

the first compressed format is a format of lesser computational complexity than

the second compressed format (The input signal in an MPEG-2 which is converted to an

MPEG-4 format, where it is well known that a MPEG-2 format requires less

computational complexity than the MPEG-4 format, column 3 lines 14-18 also exhibited

on fig 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Rao by specifically providing such element, as

taught by Mori, for the purpose of converting a MPEG2 format into a MPEG4 format,

which allows more compression and in consequence more bandwidth saving and better

network management.

Regarding **claim 25**, Rao discloses everything claimed as applied above (See

claim 23); however, it is noted that Rao fails to explicitly disclose that the first

compressed format is an MPEG-2 format and the second compressed format is an

H.264 format. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to

provide such element, as taught by Mori.

In a similar field of endeavor Mori discloses the STT of claim 23, wherein the first

compressed format is an MPEG-2 format and the second compressed format is an

H.264 format (The input signal in an MPEG-2 which is converted to an MPEG-4 format,

where it is well known that a MPEG-2 format requires less computational complexity

than the MPEG-4 format, column 3 lines 14-18 also exhibited on fig 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Rao by specifically providing such element, as taught by Mori, for the purpose of converting a MPEG2 format into a MPEG4 format, which allows more compression and in consequence more bandwidth saving and better network management.

Regarding **claim 27**, Rao discloses everything claimed as above (see claim 26); in addition, claim 27 incorporates all the limitations of claim 25. Therefore, claim 27 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 25) since it is inherent to the method claimed in claim 25.

7.   **Claims 7, 8 and 9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao in view of Segev (Patent No 7,079,578). Hereinafter referenced as Segev.

Regarding **claim 7**, Rao discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 5); however, it is noted that Rao fails to explicitly disclose that the video stream having the first bit-rate is in a format that requires higher computational complexity. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Segev.

In a similar field of endeavor Segev discloses the method of claim 5, wherein

the video stream having the first bit-rate is in a format that requires higher

computational complexity (An input video in MPEG2 format and at a higher bit rate is

transcoded in order to reduce its bit rate and size, where the higher bit rate implies a

bigger file size which means that the input file has more computational complexity,

column 1 lines 28-54).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Rao by specifically providing such element, as

taught by Segev, for the purpose of converting a MPEG2 format into a MPEG4 format,

which allows more compression and in consequence more bandwidth saving and better

network management.

Regarding **claim 8**, Rao discloses everything claimed as applied above (See

claim 5); however, it is noted that Rao fails to explicitly disclose that the video stream

having the first bit-rate and the video stream having the second bit-rate are in an

MPEG-2 format. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to

provide such element, as taught by Segev.

In a similar field of endeavor Segev discloses the method of claim 5, wherein

the video stream having the first bit-rate and the video stream having the second

bit-rate are in an MPEG-2 format. (An input video in MPEG2 format and at a higher bit

rate is transcoded in order to reduce its bit rate and size preserving the file in a MPEG2

format, column 1 lines 28-54).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Rao by specifically providing such element, as taught by Segev, for the purpose of varying the bit rate in video files in order to accommodate them in the bandwidth available, saving money and resources.

Regarding **claim 9**, Rao discloses everything claimed as applied above (See claim 5); however, it is noted that Rao fails to explicitly disclose that the video stream having the first bit-rate and the video stream having the second bit-rate are in an H.264 format. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Segev.

In a similar field of endeavor Segev discloses the method of claim 5, wherein the video stream having the first bit-rate and the video stream having the second bit-rate are in an H.264 format. (An input video in MPEG2 format and at a higher bit rate is transcoded in order to reduce its bit rate and size preserving the file in a MPEG2 format, column 1 lines 28-54; moreover, transcoding is a technique to adapt the rate of compressed video bit streams to dynamically vary their bit rate constraints, where such technique can also be applied to MPEG4 or H.264 formats, column 1 lines 55-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Rao by specifically providing such element, as taught by Segev, for the purpose of varying the bit rate in video files in order to accommodate them in the bandwidth available, saving money and resources.

8.   **Claim 39** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao in

view of Vetro et al. (Patent No 6,671,322). Hereinafter referenced as Vetro.

Regarding **claim 39**, Rao discloses everything claimed as applied above (See

claim 5); moreover, Rao discloses a storing a video presentation having a first

compression format (Hard drive [116], exhibited on fig 1);

It is noted that Rao fails to explicitly disclose the method comprising the steps of

transcoding a first portion of the video presentation such that the first portion has a

second compression format while a second portion remains in the first compression

format; decoding the first portion having the second compression format; providing the

first portion to a user; decoding the second portion having the first compression format;

and providing the second portion to the user. However, the examiner maintains that it

was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Vetro.

In a similar field of endeavor Vetro discloses a method comprising the steps of:

Transcoding a first portion of the video presentation such that the first portion has

a second compression format while a second portion remains in the first compression

format (Transcoding an input bit stream [400], column 3 lines 31-45);

decoding the first portion having the second compression format (Decoded [110]

performs a partial decoding of the bit stream, column 3 lines 36-37; where the output is

compressed at rate R_out as exhibited on fig 1);

providing the first portion to a user (Content is provided to client [702] as

exhibited on fig 7);

decoding the second portion having the first compression format (Decoded [110]
performs a partial decoding of the bit stream, column 3 lines 36-37; where the input is
compressed at rate R_in as exhibited on fig 1);

and providing the second portion to the user (Content is provided to client [702]
as exhibited on fig 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the
time the invention was made to modify Rao by specifically providing such element, as
taught by Vetro, for the purpose of providing a better and more efficient way to
recompress the received signal.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Junior O. Mendoza whose telephone number is 571-
270-3573. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8am - 5pm
EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Jefferey Harold can be reached on 571-272-7519. The fax phone number
for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Junior O Mendoza
Examiner
Art Unit 4115

/J. O. M./
November 28, 2007
/Jefferey F Harold/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4115